

Remarks

Claims 1-5, 8-11, 13, and 15-19 are pending, and claims 1-5, 8-11, 13, and 15-19 are rejected. The Applicants have amended claims 9 and 16-17. The Applicants traverse the rejection set forth by the Examiner.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 8-11, 13, and 15-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 5,684,934 (Chen) in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,236,450 (Ogura).

Claim 1 recites a method of reprinting a page of a printed document. According to the method, a print job is received by a printer to generate the printed document. A determination is made that a page of the printed document includes an error. The print job is modified to include a new logical page. A user is instructed to load the printed document into an inserter tray on the printer. Each page of the printed document is processed from the inserter tray on the printer to an output tray on the printer by determining if a current page being processed includes the error. If the current page includes the error, the current page is discarded, the new logical page from the modified print file is printed to generate a new page, and the new page is sent to the output tray in place of the current page including the error.

First, the Applicants submit that neither Chen nor Ogura teach or suggest the limitation of "if the current page includes the error, then discarding the current page" as recited in claim 1. In rejecting this limitation, the Examiner suggests that Ogura discloses this limitation, and cites to Column 9, line 23 to Column 10, line 28. The Applicants disagree. In Ogura, if a document being copied jams in an automatic document feeder mechanism, a user is instructed to re-set the entire document on a document tray. The document pages are then sent from the document tray to a discharge tray without making copies of the document until a counter value is reached (indicating a current page including the error, as asserted by the Examiner). When the counter value is reached indicating the current page including the error, the copier performs a copy process on the current page and the remaining pages in the document (Abstract). Ogura does not "discard the current page" when the counter value is reached. Instead, Ogura makes a copy of the page.

Second, the Applicants submit that neither Chen nor Ogura teach or suggest the limitation of "printing the new logical page from the modified print job to generate a new page" as recited in claim 1. In rejecting this limitation, the Examiner suggests that Ogura discloses this limitation, and cites to Column 9, line 23 to Column 10, line 28. The Applicants disagree. When the counter value is reached indicating the current page including the error, the copier performs a copy process for the current page and the remaining pages in the document (Abstract). Ogura does not "print the new logical page from the modified print job to generate a new page" when the counter value is reached. Instead, Ogura makes a copy of the page.

Third, the Applicants submit that neither Chen nor Ogura teach or suggest the limitation of "sending the new page to the output tray in place of the current page including the error" as recited in claim 1. In rejecting this limitation, the Examiner suggests that Ogura discloses this limitation, and cites to Column 9, line 23 to Column 10, line 28. The Applicants disagree. When the counter value is reached indicating the current page including the error, the copier performs a copy process for the current page and the remaining pages in the document (Abstract). Ogura does not "send the new page to the output tray in place of the current page including the error" when the counter value is reached. Instead, Ogura makes a copy of the page.

The Applicants therefore submit that claim 1 is non-obvious for at least the reasons provided. Similar arguments apply for independent claims 8 and 15.

Claim 2 recites additional details of claim 1, whereby the step of determining if the current page being processed includes the error further comprises identifying a logical page in the received print job corresponding with the current page being processed, identifying a logical page in the modified print job corresponding with the identified logical page in the received print job, determining if there is a difference between the identified logical pages, and indicating that the current page includes the error in response to determining that there is a difference.

First, the Applicants submit that neither Chen nor Ogura teach or suggest the limitation of "identifying a logical page in the received print job corresponding with the current page being processed" as recited in claim 2. In rejecting this limitation, the Examiner suggests that Ogura discloses this limitation, and cites to Column 9, line 23 to Column 10, line 28. The Applicants disagree. As discussed above, the copier in Ogura does not receive print jobs, nor does Ogura disclose any operability concerning identifying logical pages within print jobs. In Ogura, identifying a current page is performed by a simple page counter. Ogura does not disclose, for

example, that the counter is used to identify any electronic page corresponding to the printed page being processed.

Second, the Applicants submit that neither Chen nor Ogura teach or suggest the limitation of "identifying a logical page in the modified print job corresponding with the identified logical page in the received print job" as recited in claim 2. In rejecting this limitation, the Examiner suggests that Ogura discloses this limitation, and again cites to Column 9, line 23 to Column 10, line 28. The Applicants disagree. In a lacking similar to identifying logical pages in a print job, the Applicants submit that Ogura is additionally silent regarding identifying logical pages in a modified print job. For example, the copier in Ogura does not receive a print job and a modified print job, and perform any form of correlation between the two to identify logical pages.

Third, the Applicants submit that neither Chen nor Ogura teach or suggest the limitation of "determining if there is a difference between the identified logical pages" as recited in claim 2. In rejecting this limitation, the Examiner suggests that Ogura discloses this limitation, and cites to Column 9, line 23 to Column 10, line 28. The Applicants disagree. In Ogura, the copier does not determine any differences between pages. Instead, Ogura uses a counter corresponding with a page count of the previously printed document to locate the beginning of a copy process.

Fourth, the Applicants submit that neither Chen nor Ogura teach or suggest the limitation of "indicating that the current page includes the error in response to determining that there is a difference" as recited in claim 2. In rejecting this limitation, the Examiner suggests that Ogura discloses this limitation, and cites to Column 9, line 23 to Column 10, line 28. The Applicants disagree. In Ogura, the copier utilizes a page counter to identify a location within the printed document of the previous paper jam. When the page counter reaches the value of the previous paper jam location, then the copier begins performing a copy process on the remaining pages of the document. Because the pager counter is only operable to determine differences between page locations within the document, the Applicants submit that Ogura does not teach or suggest that the page counter is operable to determine any differences between logical pages within print jobs.

The Applicants therefore submit that claim 2 is non-obvious for at least the reasons provided, and for depending on base claim 1. Similar arguments apply for claims 9 and 16. Dependent claims 3-5, 10-11, 13, and 17-19 are non-obvious for at least the same reasons.

Conclusion

The Applicants submit that claims 1-5, 9-11, 13, and 15-19 are non-obvious for at least the reasons provided above, and therefore respectfully ask the Examiner to allow claims 1-5, 9-11, 13, and 15-19.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 5, 2010

/Sean J. Varley/

SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER

Sean J. Varley, Reg. No. 62,397

Duft Bornsen & Fishman, LLP

Telephone: (303) 786-7687

Facsimile: (303) 786-7691

Customer No.: 50441